

R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

THE CLAIMS

The "update" language objected to by the Examiner has been deleted, and the claims has been amended to recite "renew" language along the lines of the original claims, so as to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112.

In addition, claims 7, 13 and 19 have been amended to make a minor clarifying amendment as according to subject matter claimed (and already examined) in, for example, claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added and that no new issues have been raised which require further consideration on the merits and/or a new search. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the amendments to the claims be approved and entered under 37 CFR 1.116, and that the 35 USC 112 rejection be withdrawn.

THE PRIOR ART REJECTION

Claims 1-24 were again rejected under 35 USC 103 as being obvious in view of different combinations of USP 6,954,767 ("Kanada"), USP 6,678,783 ("Rothschild et al"), and USP 6,611,846

("Stoodley"). These rejections, however, are again respectfully traversed.

First, it is respectfully pointed out that according to the present invention as recited in each of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 24, identification information of a cassette that detects a radiographed medical image is obtained.

On page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Canada correspond to the obtaining section of the claimed present invention (which obtains the identification information of the cassette). However, as disclosed at column 14, lines 4-10 of Canada:

The image recording modalities 12 and 13 are apparatuses or systems for CT, MRI, CR, RI, US and the like for recording images of patients as digital data. The image recording modalities may record image signals obtained by photographing after conversion of the analog signal into digital data or obtain digital data by reading images of patients recorded on a film or the like upon photographing. (emphasis added)

Therefore, the image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Canada may at best be considered to correspond to the medical image reading apparatus (130) of the present invention that reads a medical image recorded on a cassette (150) (see Fig. 1, and page 53, lines 6-8 of the present application). By contrast, the claimed obtaining section may be, for example, a bar code reader (117) provided in the portable terminal (110) to read a bar code

of the cassette (150). Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada clearly do not correspond to the obtaining section of the claimed present invention (which obtains the identification information of the cassette).

In addition, it is also respectfully pointed out that column 16, lines 5-8 of Kanada cited by the Examiner with respect to the identification information of the cassette merely discloses:

The examination order information may include the date of examination, the ID number of a patient, a modality code, a code of the image requesting department and a status, for example.

Clearly, this portion of Kanada makes no mention of the identification information of the cassette of the claimed present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kanada does not disclose, teach or suggest that obtaining identification information of a cassette which detects a radiographed medical image as according to the present invention as recited in each of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 24.

Second, it is respectfully pointed out that according to the present invention as recited in each of independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 24, the obtained identification information of the cassette is stored (in a storage section of the portable terminal) and a correlation of the identification information of

the cassette and the radiographing order information is also stored (in the storage section of the portable terminal).

On page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the image archiving apparatuses 17 or 18 of Kanada correspond to the storage section (116) of the portable terminal (110) of the claimed present invention. However, as disclosed in column 14, lines 21-28 of Kanada:

The image server 14 is a computer which makes image data recorded by the image recording modalities 12 and 13 be stored in the image archiving apparatus 17 or 18, and which reads desired image data from the image data in the archiving apparatuses according to a request from the diagnostic workstation 15 or the reference terminal 16, to transfer the image data thereto. (emphasis added)

Therefore, the image archiving apparatuses 17 or 18 may at best correspond to the storage section of the control apparatus of the present invention which stores medical image data received from the medical image reading apparatus (130). Contrary to the image archiving apparatuses 17 or 18, the storage section (116) of the portable terminal (110) of the claimed present invention stores an ID of a cassette and a correlation of the cassette ID with the radiographing order information (rather than storing actual image data). Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kanada does not disclose, teach or suggest that the obtained identification information of the cassette, and a correlation of the identification information of the cassette and the

radiographing order information are stored as according to the claimed present invention.

It is also respectfully pointed out that the obtaining section which obtains identification information of the cassette, and the storage section which stores the obtained identification information of the cassette and the correlation of the identification information of the cassette and the radiographing order information, both are part of the same portable terminal according to the claimed present invention. However, contrary to the claimed present invention, the image archiving apparatuses 17 or 18, and the image recording modalities 12 and 13 of Kanada are not part of the same portable terminal.

Third, it is respectfully pointed out that according to the present invention as recited in the amended independent claims, the radiographing order information stored at the control apparatus is renewed to the radiographing order information received from the portable terminal when the stored radiographing order information and the received radiographing order information do not agree with each other, and the identification information of the cassette obtained by the portable terminal is stored and related to the radiographing order information stored in the control apparatus when the stored radiographing order information and the received radiographing order information agree with each other. And it is respectfully submitted that

none of the cited prior art references disclose, teach or suggest renewing the stored radiographing order information to the received radiographing order information, or storing and relating the obtained identification information of the cassette to the stored radiographing order information as according to the claimed present invention.

On page 5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the image server 14 of Kanada teaches renewing stored radiographing order information, and storing and relating the identification information of the cassette to the stored radiographing order information as according the claimed present invention. In addition, according to the Examiner, Kanada teaches that an image taken on the day is added to the radiographing order information (Figs. 7-8 of Kanada). However, Figs. 7-8 of Kanada merely teach that the image server 14 has a transmission function to transmit an image taken on the day in addition to a pre-fetch function to pre-fetch a past image. Clearly, the teaching of transmitting an image taken on the day of Kanada does not at all correspond to: (i) renewing radiographing order information stored in the storage section of the control apparatus to the radiographing order information received from the portable terminal, and (ii) storing and relating the identification information of the cassette to the

stored radiographing order information, as according to the claimed present invention.

Fourth, it is respectfully pointed out that on page 2 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the information processing is carried out in Kanada based on examination order information and photographing information. However, the information processing in Kanada is merely related to judging the necessity of image transmission. And it is respectfully submitted that Kanada does not at all disclose, teach or suggest the renewing processing (based on received radiographing order information) and the storing and relating processing as according to the claimed present invention.

Still further, it is noted that on pages 4-5 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner appears to indicate that the functionality of the diagnostic workstation 15 and the reference terminal 16 of Kanada corresponds to the functionality of the portable terminal of the claimed present invention. In this connection, according to the Examiner on page 4 of the Final Office Action, the workstation 15 sends to the image server 14, an order for output of an image that needs to be displayed. However, the order for output received by the image server 14 in Kanada merely requests reading and outputting a past image stored in, for example, a hard disk 14a of the image server 14. However, the order for output does not provide radiographing

order information, which is renewed according to radiographing, to the image server 14 as according to the claimed present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the workstation 15 and the reference terminal 16 of Kanada do not correspond (even functionally) to the portable terminal of the claimed present invention.

In addition, it is noted that Rothschild et al merely teaches that a radiologist may produce a report containing new information based on a medical image received at a remote image viewing system 40. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the report containing new information in Rothschild et al also does not correspond to the radiographing order information as according to the claimed present invention because the report is of information (i.e., diagnostic or interpretation information) that is added to an electronic image, whereas the radiographing order information of the claimed present invention is information for performing radiographing on patients.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that even if the teachings of Kanada and Rothschild et al were combinable in the manner suggested by the Examiner, such combination would still not achieve or render obvious the feature of the claimed present invention whereby the radiographing order information in the portable terminal is renewed according to radiographing and that this renewed radiographing order information is sent to the

control apparatus to renew the radiographing order information stored in the control apparatus.

Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited prior art references disclose, teach or suggest radiographing order information as according to the claimed present invention. In particular, in Canada the information (which is described as photographing appointment information in Fig. 7) is for searching and pre-fetching already photographed images (past image or image taken "on the day"). By contrast, in the claimed present invention, the radiographing order information is for managing instructions for performing radiographing on patients. That is, using the radiographing order information of the claimed present invention, images will be photographed.

Stoodley, moreover, has been merely cited to teach features of the dependent claims and in particular only to teach an editing section.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as recited in amended independent claims 1, 7, 13, 14, 19 and 24, and claims 2-6, 8-12, 15-18 and 21-23 respectively depending therefrom, clearly patentably distinguishes over all of the cited prior art references, taken singly or in any combination, under 35 USC 103.

* * * * *

Entry of this Amendment, allowance of the claims and the passing of this application to issue are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner has any comments, questions, objections or recommendations, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below for prompt action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Douglas Holtz/

Douglas Holtz
Reg. No. 33,902

Frishauf, Holtz, Goodman & Chick, P.C.
220 Fifth Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, New York 10001-7708
Tel. No. (212) 319-4900
Fax No. (212) 319-5101

DH:jd
encs.